

COMMERCE/WOWRA POWTS PROGRAM TELECONFERENCE
Tuesday October 04, 2005 1:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Participants:

Commerce – Brad Johnson, Harold Stanlick, Roman Kaminski

WOWRA – Bill Baudhuin, Sherri Guyse, Todd Stair

Absent:

WOWRA – Bill Bergh

Discussion Items:

-Review turn around times have been very good this installation season. Review consistency has also generally been good.

-Occasionally, there is a lag of several days from the time a plan is approved to when it arrives via USPS from the Madison office. It is unclear whether the delay is occurring getting the plans out of the office or due to the USPS, but it was noted that the packages are postmarked a day or two before they arrive. It was speculated that the delay could be due to the Commerce mailroom.

It was discovered after the teleconference that outgoing packages in Madison are sent out by the DOA mail unit, not the Commerce mailroom. The problem appears to be resolved.

-A reviewer is using a computer program to adjust plan design values, often for minor amounts that do not affect the overall system design. The adjusted values are written in the approval letter. This causes confusion for installers that use the designs.

Brad will audit the plan reviewers this winter (time permitting) and address this and any other issues that come up specifically with the reviewers.

-Submitters would prefer that reviewers approve a plan with conditions instead of holding a plan for questions or additional information. Plan turnaround time is important.

This issue was discussed with POWTS program staff.

-There is some confusion about how so-called A+0" mound plans and supporting documentation such as Interpretive Determination Reports are processed. There appears to be inconsistency among staff as to what is accepted for review. Turnaround time for these types of submittals can be 4-6 weeks which results in owners contacting the submitters about the length of time involved. This issue will be addressed at the WOWRA conference next February. Harold reported that the review procedure is being documented by Ross Fugill. If possible, the report will be prepared in time for the WOWRA conference.

This issue was discussed with POWTS program staff. The Wastewater Specialists are reviewing a document that outlines what information is required when submitting an Interpretive Report for review. The document will be available early in 2006.

-Bill Baudhuin suggested that when a complex design is submitted as an ISD it would be helpful if the submitter or their representative participate when the ISD group meets to consider the design. Roman indicated that perhaps a better job of pre-screening the submittals is needed and that if it appears that having the plan designer attend would expedite the review that arrangements be made for the designer to participate in the teleconference.

-There was discussion about what “minor revisions” could be handled by the counties. Roman asked that the WOWRA representatives develop a list of what they consider minor revisions. Counties had been given latitude in the past to review certain minor revisions. But they had and continue to have the option to require that revisions be submitted to the department.

-Roman explained the organizational structure that is used by the department. He suggested that when plan submitters have questions they should first contact the plan reviewer directly. If this does not resolve the issue, they should contact Brad. According to Brad, reviewers are to call a submitter if there are questions about a plan and if the plan cannot be approved.

POWTS program staff was reminded of these procedures.

-Todd indicated that some WOWRA members questioned why plans that include pretreatment devices but don't have maintenance information in the management plan are sometimes held, and sometimes not. One member also questioned why some plan reviewers ask for maintenance information for pretreatment devices when the information should be in the manufacturer's literature that was provided when the product was approved. He also wondered why reviewers asked for changes in pump sizes when he uses a software product provided by the pump manufacturer to select the correct pump.

The issue related to what maintenance information needs to be submitted was discussed with POWTS program staff. Maintenance information on all POWTS components is required to be in the management plan. If there have been instances where plans that include a pretreatment device were approved without the required information, then those plans should not have been approved. A manual which includes the management plan is for the owner's benefit. An owner's manual should not be confused with a technical product specification manual. Regarding the pump sizes, reviewers use the pump curves supplied by the designer when determining whether or not the appropriate pump was selected. If there is other information that reviewers should consider, then it should be provided with the plans. We would have to look at specific cases to determine why there are differences between the pump curves and the design software utilized.

The group agreed to participate in another conference call in three months.